

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:	Grefenstein et al.	Docket No.:	47587
Application No.:	08/987,775	Examiner:	KRUER, KEVIN R
Filed:	12/9/1997	Art Unit:	1773
Customer No.:	26474	Confirmation No.:	6702

---

For: UV-STABLE LAMINATES AND MOLDINGS THEREOF HAVING  
THERMAL AGING RESISTANCE

---

Honorable Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

INTERVIEW SUMMARY UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.133

Sir:


This summary includes a complete written statement of the reasons warranting favorable action presented during the telephone interview conducted on May 12, 2008.

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including Extension of Time fees, to Deposit Account 14.1437. Please credit any excess fees to such account.

NOVAK DRUCE & QUIGG, LLP  
1300 Eye St. N.W.  
Suite 1000 West  
Washington, D.C. 20005

Phone: (202) 659-0100  
Fax: (202) 659-0105

Respectfully submitted,  
NOVAK DRUCE & QUIGG, LLP



Michael P. Byrne  
Registration No.: 54,015

REMARKS

A telephone interview took place on May 12, 2008 between Examiner Kruer, and Michael Byrne. To ensure a complete and proper recordation of the substance of the interview, applicants now submit the following applicable items:

**(A) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted;**

No exhibit was shown. No demonstration was conducted.

**(B) Identification of the claims discussed;**

All of the claims were discussed.

**(C) Identification of specific prior art discussed;**

Yutaka and Rosenau were discussed.

**(D) Identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary form completed by the examiner;**

An amendment to claim 24 based on page 18, lines 18 to 22 of the specification was briefly discussed.

**(E) The general thrust of the principal arguments of the applicant and the examiner**

Applicants' representative argued that the office action states that only "Yutaka was relied upon in each pending rejection to teach ... polycarbonate[.]" but several rejections do not include Yutaka. The Examiner explained that in the rejections that fail

to cite Yutaka, Applicants should assume that Rosenau is relied upon to teach polycarbonate, despite the Office action's explicit statement that Rosenau "fails to teach or suggest a ground or granulated component consisting of polycarbonate." Applicants' representative argued that the Office action should be clarified. The Examiner disagreed.

Applicants' representative pointed out that several rejections are redundant, for example, the rejections in paragraphs 3 and 4. Applicants' representative argued that the redundant rejections should be withdrawn, if only to simplify the issues for appeal. The Examiner disagreed.

Applicants' representative indicated that an amendment to claim 24 based on page 18, lines 18 to 22 of the specification would put the application in clear condition for allowance. The Examiner indicated that the amendment would be considered.

**(F) A general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed;**

No other pertinent matters were discussed.

**(G) If appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview; and**

No agreement was reached.